

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

PAMELA HOOKS,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	
RDS AUTOMOTIVE GROUP	:	
MASERATI OF THE MAINLINE,	:	No. 23-1420
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this **26th** day of September, 2023, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Motion by Defendant RDS Enterprises III LP¹ for leave to file a reply brief (ECF 25) is **GRANTED** and the Court considers the Reply at ECF 25-1 as if it has been filed;
2. Plaintiff's Motion (ECF 22) seeking to further amend the paper docketed at ECF 20 is **DENIED**. The Court struck the paper at ECF 20 because Plaintiff lacked Defendant's consent or the Court's permission to file it (*see* ECF 21);
3. Upon consideration of Defendant's Motion (ECF 14) seeking to dismiss the Amended Complaint of Plaintiff Pamela Hooks (which the court liberally construes to consist of the documents filed at both ECF 8 and 9), Plaintiff's Response in opposition to Defendant's Motion (ECF 23), Defendants' Reply (ECF 25-1), and Plaintiff's Sur-reply (ECF 27), and consistent with the accompanying Memorandum of Law, it is **ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion (ECF 14) is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED** with leave to amend. If Plaintiff can allege sufficient facts to state a claim, she may file a Second Amended

¹ Plaintiff incorrectly identifies Defendant as "RDS Automotive Group Maserati of the Mainline."

Complaint, if any, on or before **Tuesday, October 10, 2023.**²

BY THE COURT:



² Any Second Amended Complaint must be a *single* document bearing a caption with the Court's name and the names of the parties that lists Plaintiff's claims in numbered paragraphs consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 10. Claims or allegations that are not included in a Second Amended Complaint will not be considered part of this case.